

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

KYOCERA DOCUMENT SOLUTIONS  
AMERICA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION,  
NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF THE  
TREASURY; AMANDA TRUPPA, in her  
Official Capacity as Director of the  
Division of Administration; DIVISION OF  
PURCHASE AND PROPERTY, NEW  
JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF THE  
TREASURY; and AMY F. DAVIS, in her  
Official Capacity as Acting Director of the  
Division of Purchase and Property,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.:

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
& TEMPORARY RESTRAINING  
ORDER**

**THIS MATTER** having been opened to the Court by Lowenstein Sandler LLP, counsel for Plaintiff Kyocera Document Solutions America, Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “Kyocera America”), on an application, pursuant to Federal Rule of civil Procedure 65 and Local Civil Rule 65.1, for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against Defendants Division of Administration, New Jersey Department of the Treasury (“Defendant Division of Administration”), Amanda Truppa, in her official capacity as Director of the Division of Administration

(“Defendant Truppa”), Division of Purchase and Property, New Jersey Department of the Treasury (“Defendant DPP”), and Amy F. Davis, in her official capacity as Acting Director of the Division of Purchase and Property (“Defendant Davis”) (collectively, “Defendants”);

**IT IS** on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of July, 2023,

**ORDERED** that to provide Defendants notice and opportunity to respond and to expedite Plaintiffs’ application based on a showing of exigent circumstances, Defendants shall show cause before this Court within two days from the date of this Order, \_\_\_\_\_, 2023, either in-person [or via Zoom] at \_\_\_\_\_ am/pm, why this Court should not grant Plaintiff’s application for the following temporary restraints to prevent imminent harm and maintain the status quo:

1. Enjoining Defendant Truppa during the pendency of this action from directly or indirectly enforcing N.J.S.A. 52:32-60.1 against Kyocera America;
2. Enjoining Defendant Truppa from placing Kyocera America on the list of entities engaged in “prohibited activities” in Russia or Belarus under N.J.S.A. 52:32-60.1; and
3. Enjoining Defendant Davis from (i) refusing to renew the existing contract between Kyocera America and Defendant DPP, (ii) refusing to otherwise contract with Kyocera America in the future, or (iii) taking any other adverse action

against Kyocera America, based on the provisions of N.J.S.A. 52:32-60.1 that are unconstitutional as applied to Kyocera America;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that such restraints, if granted, will remain in effect until Defendants show cause before this Court on \_\_\_\_\_, 2023, at \_\_\_\_\_ am/pm, why this Court should not grant Plaintiff's application for a preliminary injunction and enter an Order, pending trial on the merits, enjoining:

1. Defendant Truppa from directly or indirectly enforcing N.J.S.A. 52:32-60.1 against Kyocera America;
2. Defendant Truppa from placing Kyocera America on the list of entities engaged in "prohibited activities" in Russia or Belarus under N.J.S.A. 52:32-60.1; and
3. Defendant Davis from (i) refusing to renew the contract between Kyocera America and Defendant DPP; (ii) refusing to otherwise contract with Kyocera America in the future; or (iii) taking any other adverse action against Kyocera America, based on the provisions of N.J.S.A. 52:32-60.1 that are unconstitutional as applied to Kyocera America;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, if Defendants intend to file an opposition to Plaintiff's application for preliminary injunction, Defendants shall file opposition papers on or before \_\_\_\_\_, 2023;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff may file its reply by \_\_\_\_\_, 2023; and

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** Plaintiff shall serve Defendants this Order within \_\_\_\_\_ day(s) from the date of this Order.

\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge